



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,214	09/14/2000	William P. Bunton	P00-3380	1543

7590 01/20/2004

Michael F. Heim, Esquire
Conley, Rose & Tayon
600 Travis
Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77002-2912

EXAMINER

KAPADIA, MILAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/661,214

Applicant(s)

BUNTON, WILLIAM P.

Examiner

Milan S Kapadia

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the application filed 14 September 2000. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nord (5,600,793) in view of Tetrick et al. (4,570,220).

(A) As per claims 1 and 2, Nord teaches handshaking across a communication link to indicate readiness for data transmission and transmitting information after handshaking across the communication link (Nord; abstract)

Nord fails to expressly teach locking a communication link, wherein locking the communication link includes transmitting a first training sequence from a first and second port and synchronizing the receipt of the first training sequence at the first and second ports.

Art Unit: 2144

However, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Tetrick's teachings with regards to locking a communication link, wherein locking the communication link includes transmitting a first training sequence from a first and second port and synchronizing the receipt of the first training sequence at the first and second ports (Tetrick; abstract, col. 2, lines 32-62 and col. 5, line 48-col. 6, line 22). It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Nord with Tetrick's teaching with regards to this limitation, with the motivation of ensuring the communication link is available (Tetrick; col. 5, line 48-col. 6, line 22).

(B) As per claim 3, Nord fails to expressly teach wherein synchronizing the receipt of the first training sequence includes at least one of: synchronizing code group recognition and de-skewing multiple physical links. However, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Tetrick's teachings with regards to wherein synchronizing the receipt of the first training sequence includes at least one of: synchronizing code group recognition and de-skewing multiple physical links (Tetrick; lines 32-51). It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Nord with Tetrick's teaching with regards to this limitation, with the motivation of ensuring the communication link is available (Tetrick; col. 5, line 48-col. 6, line 22).

(C) As per claims 4-12, the combined system of Nord and Tetrick collectively fail to expressly teach the features of claims 4-12. However, since claims 4-12 are drawn to the

Art Unit: 2144

specifics of a particular communications protocol, it is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the collective system taught by Nord and Tetrick to implement any defined communications protocol, with the motivation improving the flexibility of the data transfer system.

(D) Claim 13 differs from the features of claims 2 and 9 by reciting “receiving the second training sequence transmitted by the first and second ports, respectively, in synchrony.” The combined system of Nord and Tetrick collectively fail to expressly teach this limitation. However, since this feature is drawn to the specifics of a particular communications protocol, it is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the collective system taught by Nord and Tetrick to implement any defined communications protocol, with the motivation improving the flexibility of the data transfer system.

(E) Claims 14-21 repeat the features of claims 4-8 and 10-12, respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above in the rejection of claims 4-8 and 10-12 and incorporated herein.

(F) As per claim 22, Nord teaches a method for training a link in a computer system, comprising:

Art Unit: 2144

configuring a first receiver in a first port using first training sequence or a second training sequence (Nord; abstract); and

transmitting the second training sequence from the first port indicating the first receiver is configured (Nord; abstract);

Nord fails to expressly teach receiving a second training sequence transmitted by a second port at the first port, the second training sequence transmitted by the second port indicating that a second receiver in the second port is configured. However, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Tetrick's teachings with regards to receiving a second training sequence transmitted by a second port at the first port, the second training sequence transmitted by the second port indicating that a second receiver in the second port is configured. (Tetrick; abstract, col. 2, lines 32-62 and col. 5, line 48-col. 6, line 22). It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Nord with Tetrick's teaching with regards to this limitation, with the motivation of ensuring the communication link is available (Tetrick; col. 5, line 48-col. 6, line 22).

(G) Claims 23-29 repeat the features of claims 4-7 and 10-12, respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above in the rejection of claims 4-7 and 10-12 and incorporated herein.

(H) As per claim 30, Nord teaches transmitting data from one of the first or second ports to the other of the first and second ports (Nord; abstract).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches a data transfer system (5,961,616); a bus adapter for transferring signals between a master unit and a slave unit, and system including the bus adapter (5,548,732); a data transmission method (4,584,684); a data processing system with an enhanced communication control system (4,674,037); and a method and apparatus for device interaction by protocol (6,202,096).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Milan S Kapadia whose telephone number is 703-305-3887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/661,214

Art Unit: 2144

mk

January 12, 2004

Page 7

Alexander Aljorchi
Alexander Aljorchi
Primary Examiner
Am 3626